

REMARKS

Claims 1-70 are pending in the present application. By this Response, claims 1, 9, 10, 13, 19, 20, 27, 28, 32, 38, 47, 48, 53, 60 and 64-70 have been amended and claims 8, 18, 26 and 38 have been canceled. Claims 1, 13, 32, 47, 48, 53, 60 and 64-70 are amended to incorporate subject matter similar to canceled claim 8, 18, 26 and 38. Claims 9, 10, 19, 20, 27, 28, 39 and 40 are amended to correct their dependency in view of the cancellation of claims 8, 18, 26 and 38. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. Examiner Interview

Applicants thank Examiner Smith for the courtesies extended Applicants' representatives during the May 27, 2004 telephone interview. During the interview, Examiner Smith indicated that the above amendments would overcome the IBM Research Disclosure reference. Therefore it is Applicants understanding that, pending an update search by Examiner Smith, the present claims are now in condition for allowance. The substance of the interview is summarized in the remarks of Section II, which follows.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Alleged Obviousness, Claims 1-4, 8-12, 48-50 and 65

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 8-12, 48-50 and 65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Page Frame Feature for Printing Electronic Documents*; International Business Machines Research Disclosure; May 1999, pages 688-690. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As to claim 1, the Office Action states:

Regarding independent claim 1, IBM Research Disclosure teaches receiving a first web document including formatting information used to display the first web document in page 688. IBM Research Disclosure teaches receiving a request to obtain a selected portion of the document in fig. 4 and pages 689-690. IBM Research Disclosure teaches a print preview feature in page 688 which generates another representation of the document from the selected portion. It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of the IBM Research Disclosure to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have created a secondary document out of the selected portion so that it could have been modified as desired by the user so that it could have been improved for output on a device such as a printer.

Office Action dated March 8, 2004, pages 2-3.

Claim 1, which is representative of the other rejected independent claims 48 and 65 with regard to similarly recited subject matter, reads as follows:

1. A method in a web browser on a data processing system for processing a document, the method comprising:
 - receiving a first web document including formatting information used to display the first web document;
 - receiving a request to present a selected portion of the first web document;
 - identifying formatting information associated with the selected portion of the first web document; and
 - creating in the web browser a second web document including the selected portion and the formatting information associated with the selected portion, in response to receiving the request, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents.

Applicants respectfully submit that the IBM Research Disclosure fails to teach or suggest creating in the web browser a second web document, which is a markup language document, including the selected portion and the formatting information associated with the selected portion, in response to receiving the request.

The IBM Research Disclosure is directed to a feature that improves print capabilities in electronic document applications, such as web browsers and e-mail applications. In the article, a Page Frame feature provides means for a user to adjust the pagination of an electronic document using a graphical user interface. The Page Frame feature provides a "frame" graphic that allows the user to frame the desired location within the current web page. Once the user has set the frame, the user can preview the current frame and the pages that occur before and after the current frame. Then the user may print from the frame location either forward or backward in the document for the desired number of pages.

Thus, with the feature described by the IBM Research Document, the feature frames the desired section to be printed and then a print preview is performed within the

current web page but is not a second web document, which is a markup language document. There is nothing within the cited pages of the IBM Research Document that teaches or suggests creating in the web browser a second web document including the selected portion and the formatting information associated with the selected portion, in response to receiving the request, where the second web document is a markup language document. Applicants respectfully submit that the document created by the IBM Research Document, in response to the framing of the user, is a print preview and not a second web document.

Furthermore, there is no suggestion in the reference to modify the reference to include such features. That is, there is no teaching or suggestion in the IBM Research Disclosure that a problem exists for which creating in the web browser a second web document, which is a markup language document, including the selected portion and the formatting information associated with the selected portion, in response to receiving the request, is a solution. To the contrary, IBM Research Disclosure only teaches framing the desired portion of the current web document and providing a print preview of the desired portion. The IBM Research Disclosure does not even recognize a need to create in the web browser a second web document, which is a markup language document, including the selected portion and the formatting information associated with the selected portion, as recited in claim 1. One of ordinary skill in the art, being presented only with the IBM Research Disclosure, and without having a prior knowledge of Applicants' claimed invention, would not have found it obvious to modify the IBM Research Disclosure to arrive at Applicants' claimed invention.

Thus, the IBM Research Disclosure fails to teach or suggest all of the features in independent claims 1, 48 and 65. At least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 48, the IBM Research Disclosure fails to teach or suggest all of the features of dependent claims 2-4, 8-12, 49 and 50. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4, 8-12, 48-50 and 65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness, Claims 5, 13-31, 51, 53-59 and 66

The Office Action rejects claims 5, 13-31, 51, 53-59 and 66 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Page Frame Feature for Printing Electronic Documents*; International Business Machines Research Disclosure; May 1999, pages 688-690 in view of Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,330,577 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As to claim 13, the Office Action states:

Regarding independent claim 13, IBM Research Disclosure teaches receiving a first web document including formatting information used to display the first web document in page 688. IBM Research Disclosure teaches receiving a request to obtain a selected portion of the document in fig. 4 and pages 689-690. IBM Research Disclosure teaches a print preview feature in page 688 which generates another representation of the document from the selected portion. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of the IBM Research Disclosure to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have created a secondary document out of the selected portion so that it could have been modified as desired by the user so that it could have been improved for output on a device such as a printer.

IBM Research Disclosure does not teach modifying the font attribute of a selected portion of a web document. Kim teaches modifying the font attribute of a selected portion of a document in fig. 4-5, 8, and the abstract. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Kim into IBM Research Disclosure to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have allowed for the changing of the font so that the user could have modified the selected portion of the web page so that it would have been more legible when outputted to the display or printer.

Office Action dated March 8, 2004, pages 5-6.

Claim 13, which is representative of the other rejected independent claims 53 and 66 with regard to similarly recited subject matter, reads as follows:

13. A method in a web browser on a data processing system for processing a document, said method comprising:
- receiving a first web document;
 - receiving a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document; and

creating in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein the font attribute, within the second web document, of the selected portion is changed in response to receiving the request to change the font attribute of the selected portion, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents.

Applicants respectfully submit that the IBM Research Disclosure and Kim, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest creating in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein the font attribute, within the second web document, of the selected portion is changed in response to receiving the request to change the font attribute of the selected portion, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents.

The deficiencies of the IBM Research Disclosure have been addressed above. That is, the IBM Research Disclosure fails to teach or suggest creating in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, where the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents. Moreover, the IBM Research Disclosure fails to teach where the font attribute, within the second web document, of the selected portion is changed in response to receiving the request to change the font attribute of the selected portion. The Office Action admits that the IBM Research Disclosure does not teach this feature; however, the Office Action alleges that Kim teaches this feature.

Kim does not provide for the deficiencies of the IBM Research Disclosure. That is, Kim does not teach or suggest creating in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, where the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents. Kim is directed to a method for displaying font information by using a preview window, when the user makes up a document, the sample of the desirable font is promptly shown to the user through the preview window. While Kim may teach changing fonts in a document, the font display provided by Kim is in response to a selection of a font in a font selection drop down box. Thus, Kim does not teach or suggest creating in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein the font attribute, within the second web document, of the selected portion is changed in response to receiving the request to change the font

attribute of the selected portion, where the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents. Moreover, there is no teaching or suggestion to include a second web document in Kim. Any conclusion that it would have been obvious to include a second web document in the system of Kim must be based entirely on a hindsight reconstruction of Applicants' claimed invention having first had benefit of Applicants' disclosure. However, even if the references were combinable and there were a suggestion to combine them in the manner alleged by the Office Action, the result would not be the claimed invention because none of the references teach the features emphasized above with regard to independent claims 13, 53 and 66.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the IBM Research Disclosure and Kim, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 13, 48, 53 and 66. At least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1, 13, 48 and 53, the features of dependent claims 5, 14-31, 51 and 54-59 are not taught or suggested in the IBM Research Disclosure and Kim, whether taken individually or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5, 13-31, 51, 53-59 and 66 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Moreover, in addition to their dependency from independent claims 1, 13, 48 and 53, the features of dependent claims 5, 14-31, 51 and 54-59 are not taught or suggested by the alleged combination of the IBM Research Disclosure and Kim, taken individually or in combination. For example, with regard to claims 5 and 51, the IBM Research Disclosure and Kim, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest creating in the web browser a third web document from the second web document, wherein the font attribute, within the third web document, of the selected portion is changed in response to receiving the request to change the font attribute of the selected portion. As shown above, neither the IBM Research Disclosure nor Kim teach or suggest creating in the web browser a second web document including the selected portion and the formatting information associated with the selected portion. Thus, the IBM Research Disclosure and Kim, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the specific features recited in claims 5 and 51.

As an additional example, with regard to claims 14 and 54, the IBM Research Disclosure and Kim, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest where the step

of creating the second web document includes inserting virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion. As shown above, neither the IBM Research Disclosure nor Kim teaches or suggests creating in the web browser a second web document including the selected portion and the formatting information associated with the selected portion. Thus, it follows that the IBM Research Disclosure and Kim, taken alone or in combination, also fail to teach or suggest the features as recited in claims 14 and 54.

Therefore, in addition to being dependent on independent claims 1, 13, 48 and 53, dependent claims 5, 14-31, 51 and 54-59 are also distinguishable over the IBM Research Disclosure and Kim by virtue of the specific features recited in these claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 5, 14-31, 51 and 54-59 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness, Claims 7, 32-46, 60-64 and 67

The Office Action rejects claims 7, 32-46, 60-64 and 67 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Page Frame Feature for Printing Electronic Documents*; International Business Machines Research Disclosure; May 1999, pages 688-690 in view of Michelman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,567 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As to claim 32, the Office Action states:

Regarding independent claim 32, IBM Research Disclosure teaches receiving a first web document including formatting information used to display the first web document in page 688. IBM Research Disclosure teaches receiving a request to obtain a selected portion of the document in fig. 4 and pages 689-690. IBM Research Disclosure teaches a print preview feature in page 688 which generates another representation of the document from the selected portion. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of the IBM Research Disclosure to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have created a secondary document out of the selected portion so that it could have been modified as desired by the user so that it could have been improved for output on a device such as a printer.

IBM Research Disclosure does not teach inserting additional page breaks indicators into a third web document. Michelman does teach

manipulating page breaks and page break indicators in a document in the abstract. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the IBM Research Disclosure so that the page margins and page breaks indicators could have been modified after the initial frame selection setting up the page breaks for the initial page. It would have been obvious and desirable to have implemented this combination so that the user could have had further control in preparing the display of the selected portion of the document for output to either a display or a printer.

Office Action dated March 8, 2004, pages 17-18.

Claim 32, which is representative of the other rejected independent claims 60 and 67 with regard to similarly recited subject matter, reads as follows:

32. A method in a web browser on a data processing system for processing a document, the method comprising:
receiving a first web document;
receiving a request to display page break indicators within the first web document;
identifying page break information for the first web document for an output device; and
creating in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein at least one virtual page break indicator is inserted into the second web document, in response to the page break information, to indicate the location of page breaks, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents.

Applicants respectfully submit that the IBM Research Disclosure and Michelman, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest creating in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein at least one virtual page break indicator is inserted into the second web document, in response to the page break information, to indicate the location of page breaks, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents.

The deficiencies of the IBM Research Disclosure are addressed above. That is, the IBM Research Disclosure fails to teach or suggest creating in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, where the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents. Moreover, the IBM Research Disclosure fails to teach wherein at least one virtual page break indicator is inserted into the second web document, in response to the page break information, to indicate the location of page breaks. The Office Action admits that the IBM Research

Disclosure does not teach this feature; however, the Office Action alleges that Michelman teaches this feature.

Michelman does not provide for the deficiencies of the IBM Research Disclosure. That is, Michelman does not teach or suggest creating in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, where the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents. Michelman is directed to a system for manipulating page-breaks in an electronic document. A user interface process provides a graphical user interface allowing a user to select a page-break within an electronic document and then identify a new location for the page-break. A system process performs the steps of moving the selected page-break to the new location and adjusting the scaling and the automatic page-breaks for the remainder of the document to accommodate the page-break at the new location. Nowhere, in the Michelman reference is a second document created, much less a second web document, which is a markup language document. While, Michelman may teach selecting page breaks within an electronic document, Michelman does not teach or suggest creating in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein the font attribute, within the second web document, of the selected portion is changed in response to receiving the request to change the font attribute of the selected portion, where the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents. Moreover, there is no teaching or suggestion to include a second web document in Michelman. Any conclusion that it would have been obvious to include a second web document in the system of Michelman must be based entirely on a hindsight reconstruction of Applicants' claimed invention having first had benefit of Applicants' disclosure. However, even if the references were combinable and there were a suggestion to combine them in the manner alleged by the Office Action, the result would not be the claimed invention because none of the references teaches the features emphasized above with regard to independent claims 32, 30 and 67.

In addition to the above, independent claims 64 reads as follows:

64. An apparatus for processing a document, comprising:
receiving means for receiving a first web document including a header;

receiving means for receiving a request to perform an action, wherein the request to perform an action comprises one of a request to present a selected portion of the first web document, a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document, and a request to display page break indicators within the first web document; and
creating means for creating in a web browser a second web document comprising at least a portion of the first web document in response to receiving the request, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents.

Applicants respectfully submit that the IBM Research Disclosure and Michelman, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest receiving means for receiving a request to perform an action, wherein the request to perform an action comprises one of a request to present a selected portion of the first web document, a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document, and a request to display page break indicators within the first web document and creating means for creating in a web browser a second web document comprising at least a portion of the first web document in response to receiving the request, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents.

The deficiencies of the IBM Research Disclosure and Michelman are addressed above. That is, the IBM Research Disclosure and Michelman, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest creating in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, where the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents. Moreover, the IBM Research Disclosure and Michelman, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest receiving means for receiving a request to perform an action, wherein the request to perform an action comprises one of a request to present a selected portion of the first web document, a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document, and a request to display page break indicators within the first web document. The Office Action admits that the IBM Research Disclosure does not teach this feature; however, the Office Action fails to address how Michelman somehow makes up for the deficiency of the IBM Research Disclosure with respect to this feature. Applicants respectfully submit that there is no section of the IBM Research Disclosure or the Michelman reference that

teaches or suggests changing a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the IBM Research Disclosure and Michelman, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 32, 60, 64 and 67. At least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1, 32 and 60, the features of dependent claims 7, 33-46 and 61-63 are not taught or suggested in the IBM Research Disclosure and Michelman, whether taken individually or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7, 32-46, 60-64 and 67 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Moreover, in addition to their dependency from independent claims 1, 32 and 60, the features of dependent claims 7, 33-46 and 61-63 are not taught or suggested by the alleged combination of the IBM Research Disclosure and Michelman, taken individually or in combination. Dependent claim 52 was not addressed in the Office Action; however, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 52 recites similar subject matter to that of dependent claim 7. With regard to claims 7 and 52, the IBM Research Disclosure and Michelman, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest creating in the web browser a third web document from the second web document, wherein at least one virtual page break indicator is inserted into the third web document, in response to the page break information, to indicate the location of page breaks. As shown above, neither the IBM Research Disclosure nor Michelman teaches or suggests creating in the web browser a second web document including the selected portion and the formatting information associated with the selected portion. Thus, it follows that the IBM Research Disclosure and Michelman, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features as recited in claims 7 and 52.

As an additional example, with regard to claims 33 and 61, the IBM Research Disclosure and Michelman, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest removing the at least one virtual page break indicator and printing the second web document. As shown above, neither the IBM Research Disclosure nor Michelman teach or suggest creating in the web browser a second web document including the selected portion and the formatting information associated with the selected portion. Thus, the

IBM Research Disclosure and Michelman, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features as recited in claims 33 and 61.

Therefore, in addition to being dependent on independent claims 1, 32 and 60, dependent claims 7, 33-46 and 61-63 are also distinguishable over the IBM Research Disclosure and Michelman by virtue of the specific features recited in these claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 7, 33-46 and 61-63 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

V. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness, Claims 6, 47 and 68-70

The Office Action rejects claims 6, 47 and 68-70 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Page Frame Feature for Printing Electronic Documents*; International Business Machines Research Disclosure; May 1999, pages 688-690 in view of of Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,330,577 B1) and Michelman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,567 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As to claim 47, the Office Action states:

Regarding independent claim 47, IBM Research Disclosure teaches receiving a first web document including formatting information used to display the first web document in page 688. IBM Research Disclosure teaches receiving a request to obtain a selected portion of the document in fig. 4 and pages 689-690. IBM Research Disclosure teaches a print preview feature in page 688 which generates another representation of the document from the selected portion. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of the IBM Research Disclosure to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have created a secondary document out of the selected portion so that it could have been modified as desired by the user so that it could have been improved for output on a device such as a printer.

IBM Research Disclosure does not teach modifying the font attribute of a selected portion of a web document. Kim teaches modifying the font attribute of a selected portion of a document in fig. 4-5, 8, and the abstract. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Kim into IBM Research Disclosure to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have allowed for the changing of the font so that the user could have modified the selected portion of the web page so

that it would have been more legible when outputted to the display or printer.

IBM Research Disclosure does not teach inserting additional page breaks indicators into a third web document. Michelman does teach manipulating page breaks and page break indicators in a document in the abstract. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the IBM Research Disclosure so that the page margins and page breaks indicators could have been modified after the initial frame selection setting up the page breaks for the initial page. It would have been obvious and desirable to have implemented this combination so that the user could have had further control in preparing the display of the selected portion of the document for output to either a display or a printer.

Office Action dated March 8, 2004, pages 26-27.

Claim 47, which is representative of the other rejected independent claims 68, 69 and 70 with regard to similarly recited subject matter, reads as follows:

47. A method in a web browser on a data processing system for processing a document, the method comprising:
receiving a first web document;
receiving a request to perform an action, wherein the request to perform an action comprises one of a request to present a selected portion of the first web document, a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document, and a request to display page break indicators within the first web document; and
creating in the web browser a second web document comprising at least a portion of the first web document in response to receiving the request, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents.

Applicants respectfully submit that the IBM Research Disclosure, Kim and Michelman, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest creating in the web browser a second web document comprising at least a portion of the first web document in response to receiving the request, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents.

The deficiencies of the IBM Research Disclosure, Kim and Michelman are addressed above. That is, the IBM Research Disclosure, Kim and Michelman, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest creating in the web browser a second web document comprising at least a portion of the first web document in response to receiving the request, where the first web document and the second web document are

markup language documents. Moreover, there is no teaching or suggestion in any of the references to include a second web document. Any conclusion that it would have been obvious to include a second web document in the IBM Research Disclosure, Kim or Michelman must be based entirely on a hindsight reconstruction of Applicants' claimed invention having first had benefit of Applicants' disclosure. However, even if the references were combinable and there were a suggestion to combine them in the manner alleged by the Office Action, the result would not be the claimed invention because none of the references teaches the features emphasized above with regard to independent claims 47 and 68-70.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the IBM Research Disclosure, Kim and Michelman, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 47 and 68-70. At least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1, the features of dependent claim 6 is not taught or suggested in the IBM Research Disclosure, Kim and Michelman, whether taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6, 47 and 68-70 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Moreover, in addition to its dependency from independent claim 1, the features of dependent claim 6 is not taught or suggested in the IBM Research Disclosure, Kim and Michelman, taken alone or in combination. With regard to claim 6, the IBM Research Disclosure, Kim and Michelman, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest receiving a request to display page break indicators within the third web document, identifying page break information for the third web document for an output device, and creating in the web browser a fourth web document from the third web document, wherein at least one virtual page break indicator is inserted into the fourth web document, in response to the page break information, to indicate the location of page breaks. As shown above, neither the IBM Research Disclosure, Kim nor Michelman teaches or suggests creating in the web browser a second web document including the selected portion and the formatting information associated with the selected portion. Thus, the IBM Research Disclosure, Kim and Michelman, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest receiving a request to display page break indicators within the third web document, identifying page break information for the third web document for an output

device, and creating in the web browser a fourth web document from the third web document, wherein at least one virtual page break indicator is inserted into the fourth web document, in response to the page break information, to indicate the location of page breaks.


Therefore, in addition to being dependent on independent claim 1, dependent claim 6 is also distinguishable over the IBM Research Disclosure, Kim and Michelman by virtue of the specific features recited in this claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

VI. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the prior art of record and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: June 4, 2004



Francis Lammes
Reg. No. 55,353
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 367-2001
Agent for Applicants